UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY (973) 776-7700

CHAMBERS OF

JAMES B. CLARK, III UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE U.S. COURTHOUSE 50 WALNUT STREET, ROOM 2060 NEWARK, NJ 07102

March 12, 2024

LETTER ORDER

Re: <u>Doe v. Smith</u>

Civil Action No. 24-634 (ES)

Dear Counsel:

The Court is in receipt of multiple letters from various non-parties in this matter requesting

generally: (1) the entry of proposed protective orders, which are not consented to by the parties in this

matter; and (2) that they be permitted to be identified in this matter by pseudonym. See Dkt. Nos. 31, 39,

40. Upon review of the aforementioned letters, as well as Plaintiff's responses thereto [Dkt. Nos. 32, 41],

the Court orders as follows:

1) Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2(a)(3) and Local Civil Rule 5.2, any public

filing containing "the name of an individual known to be a minor . . . may include only" the

minor's initials. Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(a)(3).

2) Any request to proceed by pseudonym shall be made via formal motion.

3) The parties in this matter, and any interested non-parties, shall meet and confer regarding the

scope and form of any proposed discovery confidentiality/protective order to be submitted to

the Court. If an agreement regarding the scope and form of any such proposed order cannot be

reached, the parties shall submit a proposed order in accordance with Appendix S of the Local

Civil Rules. Any party/individual requesting modifications to the Appendix S order, without

Case 2:24-cv-00634-ES-JBC Document 44 Filed 03/12/24 Page 2 of 2 PageID: 259

consent from the other relevant parties, shall file a formal and properly supported motion

seeking the entry of a protective order.

4) Pending the entry of a discovery confidentiality order and/or during the pendency of any

dispute relating to the entry of a discovery confidentiality order, discovery shall proceed on a

temporary attorney's eyes only basis and any non-party minors and their family members shall

continue to be identified by their initials.

5) The absence of a discovery confidentiality/protective order alone shall not provide any

party/individual with a proper basis to refuse to comply with a properly served subpoena or

request for discovery unless accompanied by a fully explained and supported objection.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ James B. Clark, III

JAMES B. CLARK, III

United States Magistrate Judge